United Nations A/C.2/71/SR.8–E/2017/SR.4

General Assembly
Seventy-first session

Distr.: General
25 October 2016

Economic and Social Council
2017 session

Original: English

Official Records

General Assembly
Second Committee
8th meeting

Economic and Social Council
2017 Session
4th meeting

Summary record of the joint meeting of the Second Committee and the Economic and Social Council
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday, 7 October 2016, at 10 a.m.

Co-Chair: Mr. Djani (Chair, Second Committee) ..... (Indonesia)
Co-Chair: Mr. Shava (President, Economic and Social Council) ..... (Zimbabwe)

Contents

The changing political economy of globalization: Multilateral institutions and the 2030 Agenda

Opening statements

Keynote address

Panel discussion

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be sent as soon as possible, under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, to the Chief of the Documents Control Unit (srcorrections@un.org), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (http://documents.un.org/).

16-17400 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

The changing political economy of globalization: Multilateral institutions and the 2030 Agenda

Opening statements

1. **Mr. Shava** (Zimbabwe), Co-Chair, welcoming the keynote speaker, Mr. Thomas Friedman (Columnist at *The New York Times* and author), the moderator, Ms. Pamela Falk (Foreign affairs analyst, Columbia Broadcasting System (CBS) news), and the panellists, Ms. Anu Madgavkar (Partner, McKinsey Global Institute), Mr. Michael Plummer (Director and Professor of international economics, School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University) and Ms. Mariama Williams (Senior Programme Officer, Global Governance for Development programme, South Centre) said that following the destruction and despair of the Second World War, the United Nations, and its Economic and Social Council, had been established on the premise that global peace could be sustained only if accompanied by efforts to advance the development of all people across the globe. Having now celebrated its seventieth anniversary, the Council had witnessed how globalization could transform the world in every aspect of life. However, that transformation had not afforded its benefits to everyone, and too many people had been left to face the relentless forces of global competition alone. The current meeting would be an opportune forum to highlight policies that would leave no one behind, and consider the role that the United Nations system and multilateral institutions could play in shaping new norms and standards of conduct for a better world. Seventy years on, the fundamentals for that endeavour were now in place. In developed and developing countries alike, people hoped for access to education and health, opportunities to share in entrepreneurship and technological innovation, and the achievement of a better life through hard work. Political narratives that proposed solutions based on isolationism or tribal instincts must therefore be changed. Climate change, poverty, conflicts and terrorism were daunting challenges that could not be addressed by any one country alone. A retreat from multilateralism and meaningful global cooperation would pose a threat to sustainable peace and prosperity for all, an ideal that could be attained only by inclusive means.

2. **Mr. Djani** (Indonesia), Co-Chair, said that globalization had been hailed as a principal driver of economic growth, a force for global prosperity and a catalyst for development; his country, Indonesia, had benefited from significant increases in growth and employment as it became better integrated into the global economy, and pursued efforts to eradicate poverty and achieve the Sustainable Development Goals. However, that positive view of globalization was increasingly being challenged, as deep fractures and barriers had emerged in recent years. The global financial crisis of 2008 had impacted every country in the world; inequalities had reached record levels; many developing countries continued to struggle with the adverse effects of a global system that benefited a powerful few; issues of migration and refugees had brought new problems and pressures to many Governments and communities; and technological innovation was displacing many workers. In that so-called globalized world, divisions and gaps had proliferated, and special attention should therefore be given to ensuring an enabling environment for countries, especially developing countries, so that they could make meaningful contributions to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals. Given that people around the world would be looking to global institutions such as the United Nations for solutions, it was important to question whether such organizations, given their limited resources and the pressures of a growing global population, were indeed up to the task. Trends of protectionism and nationalism also invited the question of whether the current global economic system was adequate to address the myriad challenges facing the world. Through the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, the international community must demonstrate that the answers to those questions were within reach, and that globalization could be turned into a force of good for all.

Keynote address

3. **Mr. Friedman** (Columnist at *The New York Times* and author), accompanying his address with a digital slide presentation, said that in the current age of acceleration, it was very important to give oneself permission to pause, reimagine and reflect. By pausing to share expertise during a series of recent interactions with an Ethiopian parking attendant at his workplace, for instance, he had better elucidated his own

understanding of the way the world worked. He believed that a newspaper column was intended to provoke a reaction from readers, and the type of reaction produced was determined by readers' value systems and their understanding of how the world worked, and the ways in which it affected, and was affected by, people and culture.

4. The three most powerful forces of the modern world were globalization, climate change and technology. Given the broad spectrum of major technological advances in 2007, it was fair to say that that year had been the greatest technological inflection point since the invention of the printing press. However, the significance of 2007 had quickly been overshadowed by the economic collapse of 2008. Humanity was struggling to adapt to the pace of technological progress, and enormous dislocations and discrepancies were occurring as a result.

5. The main challenges lay in learning faster and governing smarter during a period in which life was being ever further pervaded by the impact of cloud computing and related technologies. The new worldwide flow of ideas affected all aspects of life, through social networks and instant messaging, news stories and information, sharing and dissemination of opinions, e-commerce, crowdfunding and mobile payments, live streaming, and online music, education and design tools.. Those flows had impressively broadened participation in the global economy, resulting in a world more interconnected than ever before, and clearly that trend would continue unabated. Countries that built infrastructure and educated their people to make use of connections to information and resources would be successful in the twenty-first century. It was crucial to recognize that the new globalization, which revolved around flows, entailed a shift from stocks of physical goods to stocks of information.

6. The accelerations of globalization, climate change and technology were fundamentally reshaping the world. Consequently, it was necessary to reimagine the realms of the workplace, geopolitics, community and ethics. In the workplace, the great challenge lay in finding ways to help workers stay afloat and survive in new environments augmented by technology. Companies should be viewed in terms of their human resources policies, on how they encouraged their employees to build their skills continuously, and what financial or other incentives they provided for that purpose. Jobs everywhere were being "pulled up" in that they required not only better mathematics and science skills but also creativity and collaboration, "pulled out" in that they were being opened to higher numbers of qualified candidates worldwide, and "pulled down" in that they were often quickly made obsolete. Under the new social contract, which was proliferating to all countries, the worker was expected to be fully capable of absorbing new information and adopting new practices. Job-seekers and workers alike needed to be more motivated and entrepreneurial than ever before. At the same time, they had at their disposal a vastly more comprehensive set of technological tools that could serve to assist them in their training and professional duties.

7. In the realm of education, wealthy parents in the United States of America could afford to spend significant amounts to prepare their children to take college entrance examinations, while lower-income parents could not. In 2014, the College Board had partnered with the Khan Academy, a non-profit educational organization, to enable students to take pre-college entrance examinations and receive specific feedback tailored to their performance. Students would then be directed to a site with practice exercises to improve on weak areas, and yet another site with accelerated courses for strong areas. A third site presented college scholarships available to students. In 2015, 1.4 million American students had signed up for free preparation courses through the College Board and the Khan Academy, which were available through an intelligent algorithm.

8. Another programme making use of intelligent algorithms was called "opportunity@work". That initiative enabled students who had not completed full college programmes to have their skills evaluated. The students were given credit for skills already mastered, and were then linked with companies which were prepared to hire them. That programme was reshaping the workplace, enabling people to live above the line of technological change. People who believed that existing banks and political systems needed to be destroyed in order to survive the challenges of globalization should learn about the assistance (both human and digital) provided by such programmes, through intelligent algorithms.

9. Transformative forces were reshaping politics. The world was currently facing three types of climate change at once. Climate change was affecting the weather; but there was also a change in the climate of globalization, moving from stocks to flows; and a change in technology, an exponential acceleration. To survive those changes, resilience and propulsion were required. Resilience was needed for adaptation, and propulsion in order to move forward with innovation.

10. The expert in building resilience and propulsion in the face of a changing climate was Mother Nature. Her methods to do so were many: adaptation through natural selection; pluralism and diversity, through a multitude of species; sustainability, as nature's processes were circular; entrepreneurship, as any vacuum in nature was immediately filled with a plant or animal adapted to that niche; patience; co-evolution of compatible species, which created strong resilience; and the law of bankruptcy, where failures were killed and their energy was used to nourish successes.

11. The countries and political parties that most closely mirrored Mother Nature's characteristics would thrive in the age of acceleration. That was the reason why the political parties of countries in attendance were in disarray, as were those in the United States of America. The world needed radical entrepreneurship to pay for the safety nets that would be required, because the age of acceleration would be too fast for some people. Radical entrepreneurship should co-evolve with safety nets. The lack of co-evolution was unsustainable and was the cause of the related difficult transformation being undergone by political parties.

12. In his book "Thank You for Being Late", he had included a chapter on ethics entitled "Is God in Cyberspace?" That was the biggest ethics question in the age of rapid technological growth and globalization. He had consulted with his spiritual teacher, a brilliant Talmudic scholar, who had responded that there were two concepts of the Almighty. One was a biblical concept according to which God smote evil and rewarded good. Yet God certainly was not in cyberspace, which was full of pornography, crime, gambling, cheating, lying and trolling. An alternative, post-biblical concept of God existed, whereby God revealed himself by how humans behaved. If humans wanted God to be in cyberspace, they must bring Him there through their behaviour.

13. In the age of globalization of flows, where all information was being digitized and transited through a realm where everyone was connected and no one was in charge, the question of values had become extremely important. Humans had never been more God-like as a species; they could now achieve both good and evil more quickly, efficiently and cheaply than ever before. If values did not come to guide human behaviour once again, humans would be no more than a bad biological experiment. Values came from strong families and healthy communities. Healthy communities would be the most important governing block in the twenty-first century, would provide the greatest restraint of human behaviour and would be the greatest educator for strong values. They would move with the storm of accelerated technological change and globalization, drawing energy from it, yet providing a base of dynamic stability within it. The politics of all countries would be a struggle between protectionists, and those who embraced change, whom he lauded.

14. **Mr. Motter** (Inter-Parliamentary Union) said that people-centred development was a strong focus of the Committee. However, Mr. Friedman's analysis had been posited on an assumption that markets and technology were uncontrollable. There could and must be some social control of change, in the form of democracy. People and institutions could only face so much change. He asked how change could be mastered and brought to a human level. Instead of corporate-driven change, a collaborative model must be imagined where people had a stake in businesses and could make social decisions on production. People must be in control of their Governments. The change described by Mr. Friedman had been driven by corporations and chief executive officers, which was disastrous. The end goal of that change must be considered. Small businesses were being driven out of existence, affecting communities, which was unsustainable in the developed world. Levers must be found to master the change. Technology could only improve efficiency, but greater production would lead to destruction. The situation must be viewed in the light of social progress, so that people could work less and enjoy more, produce less and have less impact on the environment.

15. **Ms. Flores** (Panama) said that social media and technology had changed the workplace at the United Nations. The Netherlands had created a network that helped small missions to participate in meetings where

they were not present and follow multiple sessions at once through Twitter. She had created a What's App group of permanent representatives to remind colleagues of events, and representatives from 138 of the 193 States Members of the United Nations had joined that group. Some members had joined What's App to participate in the group, through which news, reminders, welcomes and farewells were shared. A special energy, both positive and negative, was generated when everyone learned of news at the same time. The power of technology must be leveraged to create greater depth, which was required at the United Nations to make informed decisions.

16. **Mr. Ten-Pow** (Guyana) said that he shared Mr. Friedman's positive outlook, because globalization, led by technology, was a key driver of economic growth in the world. Guyana was a small, coastal, developing country that relied on the export of a few commodities. Such countries were seeking ways to become competitive and share in the benefits of globalization. He requested ideas on how those countries could meaningfully participate in the global marketplace.

17. **Ms. Santos** (Canada) said that if radical entrepreneurship was needed to pay for social safety nets, that would involve innovation and risk-taking. However, Governments tended to innovate at a slower pace and were less amenable to taking risks. If it was the responsibility of Governments to ensure that no one was left behind, the question arose as to how Governments could be more innovative.

18. **Mr. Friedman** (Columnist at *The New York Times* and author) said that he shared the concerns that had been expressed. As a technological determinist, he believed that what could be done would be done. If the technology was available, people would use it for good or for ill; as a result, the question of governance and values would become paramount. In writing his book "Thank You for Being Late" he had discovered that the most important aspect of the issues discussed had been human-to-human interactions. He had told the story of his hometown, St. Louis Park, a suburb of Minneapolis, Minnesota, which, like many such towns, was welcoming the diverse and international workforce of the future. The human values required for such integration could only come from strong communities, faith leaders and human-to-human interaction.

19. He had become a journalist because he loved taking complex ideas and trying to make them understandable. The need for interpreting a complex world would increase, as the flow of information could render people vulnerable to demagogues. In his book, he celebrated slowing down, connecting with community and acknowledging the aspects of life that could not be downloaded from the Internet. He was neither a pessimist nor an optimist, because both were forms of fatalism; he advocated hope.

20. Countries attempting to ascertain the best way to participate meaningfully in the global economy must have the infrastructure to participate in the world of information flows. People must be enabled to connect to those flows, which would constitute the centre of economic development, and must be educated to a mode of life-long learning. Without infrastructure and education, the challenges would be extreme.

21. People from anywhere in the world could aspire to obtaining the best jobs of the future, which would be jobs combining science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) skills with human empathy. For example, doctors increasingly had access to vast troves of data, but still needed to be able to transmit such information to patients in an empathetic way. Job application websites sometimes combined online tests with the possibility of being connected with a live coach. New jobs were being created; one example was the task of tagging sharks so that their location could be tweeted when they approached beaches where humans were swimming. The job markets of the future would be unpredictable, but if people were enabled to be connected and educated, they would be able to take advantage of such opportunities.

22. Empathy must not be forgotten when focusing on innovation. Impressive innovation was occurring in the United States at the local level, where business communities were working together with schools, philanthropists and local governments to lift up workers and young people to be able to thrive in the age of acceleration. Such initiatives transcended political party lines. People must work together and solve problems creatively because of the dearth of resources.

23. Top-down systems that had been governed for many years by an iron fist would have problems. A post-authoritarian era had begun. Societies that were

truly pluralistic, enabling people to forge social contracts horizontally without the need for vertical government, would have a huge advantage in the age of acceleration, and not only in terms of governance and social stability. In an era when speed mattered, there would be many more ideas created by that pluralism and, through collaboration, those ideas could be turned into products, goods and services. Pluralism would provide a huge political and economic advantage.

Panel discussion

24. **Ms. Falk** (Foreign affairs analyst, CBS News), moderator, said that the panel would consider whether globalization was a driver, or whether it hurt the poor and led to unequal development. In addition, since inequality was seen as a driver of public discontent, the panel would consider whether income inequality was a side effect of globalization and whether it had failed the next generation.

25. **Ms. Madgavkar** (Partner, McKinsey Global Institute), panellist, said that the world was seeing cataclysmic changes and disruptive transformations on multiple vectors. In that context, she and her colleagues at the McKinsey Global Institute had undertaken a study of how those developments had affected the labour market, workers and households. Her research had focused on 25 advanced economies. Between 1993 and 2005, only 2 per cent of households had had flat or falling incomes, but that situation had changed dramatically between 2005 and 2014, a period during which almost 70 per cent of households had had incomes that were lower than during the previous decade. Although Governments had increased transfers to households, through such measures as unemployment benefits and higher social security, about 25 per cent of households were still worse off. While income inequality, with more income accruing to the top 5 per cent, had been a steady worldwide trend since the mid-1970s, people had generally felt that their lot would improve compared with their parents' generation. That basic assumption had come under severe challenge in the developed world between 2005 and 2014.

26. The question was why that mattered. It was, of course, significant at the economic level; however the human dimension must be taken into account. The McKinsey Global Institute had therefore conducted a survey asking people whether they felt that they were now better or worse off. Approximately 30 to 40 per cent of survey participants had felt that they were doing better; about 25 to 30 per cent had said that they were not sure; and a sizeable 30 to 40 per cent of households had said that their situation had grown significantly worse over the previous 5 to 10 years, and that their standard of living was lower than that of their parents. Of that latter segment, a portion equating to 10-15 per cent of the total population had also felt pessimistic that things would change, and had indicated that they did not believe that future outcomes for themselves or their children would improve. If economic drivers did not change for the other people in that segment the share of pessimists would only increase.

27. The people who felt that their situations would not improve were particularly negative about many aspects of globalization. They believed that immigration was undermining the cohesiveness of their societies, and that cheap, low-cost labour from overseas was unfairly leading to job losses in their economies. The growing swell of anti-globalization sentiment had been linked by the researchers to economic outcomes and to questioning whether the future would be better.

28. The worsening economic outcomes for middle-income households had been broken down into several very important underlying drivers. Aggregate demand effects, which resulted from the great recession and the very slow recovery, had prevented overall demand and output from growing. Demographic effects ,in the form of aging, which reduced the ability of households to have members in the workforce; and adverse labour market effects, which meant that even the wage share that was still going to workers was moving away from low and middle-skill workers and towards better-educated workers. Those structural, long-term and accelerating forces, largely owing to technological change, had led to income contraction for the median household. Labour market dynamics had changed and people could not keep up with skills development.

29. The question was what to do about that problem. There was no real answer, but there were several themes, all of which were important to both developed and developing countries. For too long, the focus had

been on gross domestic product (GDP) growth, GDP per capita growth rates, and unemployment rates. New metrics must be found to better reflect what people were actually experiencing. Growth must be revived through productivity, which was fundamentally important, as redistributing a shrinking pie would not be sufficient. The worst effects of globalization must be mitigated for people who had trouble adjusting. It would be important to work with and help individuals, whether disadvantaged groups or those who did not have access to good quality education. Minimum wages must be reformed, and worker compensation must be linked more closely to company profits. Transfers must be viewed in a much more progressive way, targeting those with flat or shrinking incomes. A greater entrepreneurial spirit must prevail in thinking about taxation and transfers. Finally, engagement would be key. Civil society, the state, local authorities, and business must come together to engage with the challenges at hand.

30. **Mr. Plummer** (Director and Professor of International Economics, School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University), panellist, said that globalization was associated with increases in inequality. Trade integration might be expected to reduce inequality in developing countries because they had a comparative advantage in the cost of labour, but in a more sophisticated model, technological changes meant that more skills were required, so that inequality was likely to increase. When global value chains were taken into account, the effect of trade integration was less marked. The Trans-Pacific Strategic Economic Partnership Agreement would benefit skilled labour and reduce the price of imported goods for the very poor.

31. Although trade was associated with negative trends at the global level, it would be undesirable to reverse the pace of technological change. Instead, the effects of technology should be managed better through public policies that relied on innovative thinking. As globalization intensified, innovative public policies would be needed in both developed and developing countries. Structural change was of great importance in a fast-growing global economy, but if growth stalled — and business cycles were a reality of capitalism — poverty could increase.

32. The public perception of trade was not the same as the reality. In the United States of America there was a strong focus on the Trans-Pacific Strategic Economic Partnership Agreement, but opposition to the Agreement was anecdotal, not evidence-based; moreover, the debate was all from a United States point of view, not a global one. In reality, the Agreement would benefit skilled labour and reduce the price of imported goods for the very poor, which would benefit developing countries in particular. Measures should be in place to help those who were displaced by structural change, but there was a need to refocus. The status quo would have the effect of impeding progress elsewhere.

33. Meanwhile, the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, which had been expected to be concluded very expeditiously since it involved only developed countries, was being paused because politically it was too sensitive. Global institutions needed to evolve with the twenty-first century. The most recent successful global agreement on trade had been implemented in 1995. The global economy had changed yet there were still no global rules. Some mega-regional arrangements could begin to fill that vacuum by creating those rules for the benefit not just of member States but of all countries.

34. **Ms. Williams** (Senior Programme Officer, Global Governance for Development programme, South Centre), panellist, said that 2017 would be an interesting year as the implementation of the 2030 Agenda continued and the Paris Agreement under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change entered into force. The question was how to shape the future in a rapidly accelerating world in a context of large disparities. In an era of authoritarian capitalism, Governments needed to be more decisive in enforcing fiscal discipline.

35. Globalization had lost momentum since 2008, and the trend was towards stagnation and a persistent slowdown in developed countries' and developing countries' economies. There were fears of a vacuum of global leadership in dealing with those challenges. People were anguished about hyper-globalization or runaway globalization. Globalization had led to greater unfairness and a shift away from people-centred democracy and towards more one-sided benefits for the 1 per cent and international financial capital. Governments and people must right the ship.

Multilateralism had been a casualty of that dismay and questioning about globalization, yet it had been beneficial for developing countries, hence the success of the Paris Agreement. Globalization so far had been touted as inexorable but it was defective and had been detrimental to living standards, as reflected in the migrant crisis. It had benefited financial interests and skilled professionals, but not those at the bottom or in the middle. Those underlying grievances were real and needed to be addressed. The benefits of hyper-globalization had been oversold.

36. The emphasis should be on local decision-making, public policies focused on employment creation, and the creation of policy space for Governments to provide an enabling environment for growth. However, that was not yet a reality for most people in developing countries, such as the majority who were involved in subsistence farming. To leave no one behind, it was not enough to tweak globalization. Deglobalization was already happening. As trade growth rates fell, only short-term capital flows were growing, and output was decreasing. For developing countries, the trade and investment rules had not really worked and therefore needed to be changed in order to increase direct control of speculative cross-border financial crises. Developing countries needed policy space to be able to provide the training needed to build an infrastructure that could take advantage of new technologies and innovation.

37. Policy space deserved as much attention as market access, otherwise the needed institutional re-engineering and rewriting of multilateral and international rules would not occur. Economic diversification should be promoted to spur investment in public infrastructure through peer-to-peer learning, access to digital technologies and the like. Yet there was still a digital divide because of power outages and bandwidth issues. Reforms of international financial institutions such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank Group should be accelerated, and developing countries should have an increased voice in those institutions. High-income countries in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development still maintained a dominant position on decision-making on critical issues for developing countries.

38. Tweaking was not sufficient to implement the 2030 Agenda. Significant reforms and restructuring were needed to change lives, create employment and provide social protection. People needed a physical environment in which electricity, communications and other infrastructure was available so that they could be productive. In many countries, including her own country, Jamaica, the stranglehold of debt did not leave much policy space to make the investments that were needed. There was therefore a divide between countries constrained by fiscal policies and developed countries that pulled capital away from developing countries, whose financial entities needed to be able to support the financing of the 2030 Agenda, otherwise the divide would persist.

39. **Mr. Friedman** (Columnist at *The New York Times* and author) said that developing countries and middle-income countries needed infrastructure in order to connect with global flows and educate their people. Otherwise they did not stand a chance. The common denominator was that there had been a period of radical technological change and climate change. Radical social innovation was needed, because social technologies lagged behind physical technologies.

40. **Mr. Plummer** (Director and Professor of International Economics, School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University), said that taxation policies should not kill the goose that laid golden eggs. There was a need for an effective way of redistributing income without distorting markets. A progressive approach to redistribution was important, but tinkering with institutions could be counterproductive. One study had shown that, in India, trade liberalization had increased poverty, but in East Asia trade had lifted 965 million people out of poverty, according to the World Bank Group. In India, the increase in poverty was not necessarily caused by trade liberalization, but could be the result of rigid labour markets and ossified social structures that were unable to compete in the twenty-first century. Redistribution was needed but bottom-up growth was also necessary.

41. **Ms. Madgavkar** (Partner, McKinsey Global Institute)) said that inequality needed to be examined at all levels. Equality of opportunity in the areas of education, health care, financial inclusion and access to digital technologies was very important. It might not be possible to achieve equality of outcomes, but

equality of opportunity and freedom of choice were key. Some aspects of globalization had enabled developing countries to embrace technologies and promote domestic innovation.

42. **Ms. Williams** (Senior Programme Officer, Global Governance for Development programme, South Centre) said that inequality had multiple dimensions, for example between persons with disabilities and the able-bodied, or people of different ages, genders and the like. Globalization offered many solutions for reducing inequality between and within countries. In developing countries, systemic issues such as illicit capital flows needed to be addressed because of their impact on Government budgets. Resources needed to be mobilized in order to address tax avoidance and tax evasion by financial elites.

43. For many developing countries, inequality was not about perception, but was a matter of life and death. It impeded resilience and response to disasters, including extreme weather events, which in developed countries primarily impacted property. Solutions had been proposed in financing for development conferences but more generally there was a need for policy innovation in developed countries, which would spill over into developing countries.

44. **Mr. Motter** (Inter-Parliamentary Union) said that managed trade had made developed countries wealthy. Trade competition used to be based on innovation and quality, not just on low prices. Free trade was therefore a misnomer. Behind the curtain of trade in goods were investment agreements that were all about capital mobility but that was not part of the original theory of free trade and comparative advantage. Capital-rich countries focused on capital-rich goods and labour-rich countries focused on labour-intensive goods; as a result, all countries moved up the production ladder. Comparative advantage was not static.

45. **Mr. Sinha** (India) said that Mr. Plummer would certainly be able to say more about the specific case of India. The Sustainable Development Goals and the 2030 Agenda were intended to act as a response to the backlash against globalization, and resources would be need to found in order to achieve and implement them.

46. **Mr. Shava** (Zimbabwe), Co-Chair, said that all elements were in place to find the collective will to make the world a better place. The milestone global agreements of 2015 provided a solid foundation, and the institutions that comprised the United Nations system, as well as their intergovernmental bodies, represented strong mechanisms at the global and regional levels. It was now necessary to summon the political will to get things done, along with partners in the private sector and civil society, and other non-governmental actors.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.